arXiv:1607.04868v1 [math.CO] 17 Jul 2016

VECTORS OF MATROIDS OVER HYPERFIELDS

LAURA ANDERSON

Abstract. We enrich Baker's theory of matroids over hyperfields with notions of vectors and covectors. In the case of oriented matroids, these F-vectors and F-covectors coincide with the usual signed vectors and signed covectors. In the case of matroids over a field F, the F-covector set resp. F-vector set of an F-matroid is a linear subspace of F^E resp. its orthogonal complement.

The theory of "matroids with extra structure", including oriented matroids ([BLVS$^+$99]), valuated matroids ([DW92]), and phased matroids (originally called "complex matroids" in [AD12]),[1] recently found a beautiful common description in a paper of Baker ([Bak16]) as *matroids over hyperfields*. A hyperfield is similar to a field, but with addition being multivalued. The concept of matroids over a hyperfield generalizes the concept of linear subspaces of a vector space F^n – in fact, when F is a field then an F-matroid corresponds exactly to a linear subspace of F^n.

One example of a hyperfield is the *sign hyperfield* $\mathbb{S}$ (Definition 4). Matroids over $\mathbb{S}$ are exacly oriented matroids. The theory of oriented matroids is the grandmother of all theories of matroids with extra structure, with a rich theory and powerful connections to geometry and topology. Baker's paper suggests broad generalizations of this theory across other hyperfields. On the other hand, his work did not completely generalize one key aspect of oriented matroids, namely signed vector axioms and signed covector axioms.

The present paper fills this gap. We give a definition of F-vectors and F-covectors of a matroid over a hyperfield F so that:

(1) if F is a field, so that an F-matroid corresponds to a subspace of some F^E, then the F-covectors of that F-matroid are just the elements of the subspace,
(2) if $F = \mathbb{S}$, so that an F-matroid is an oriented matroid, then the F-vectors and F-covectors coincide with the signed vectors and signed covectors in the sense of oriented matroids, and
(3) for general hyperfields F, the relationships between F-(co)vectors and F-(co)circuits is similar to the relationships for oriented matroids.

However, our definitions look substantially different from the usual oriented matroid definitions.

Section 1 will give background, including a summary of some results on matroids over hyperfields from [Bak16] and examples of hyperfields of particular interest, introduced by Viro in [Vir10]. Section 2 will introduce vector and covector axioms for

[1] Since publishing [AD12], my fellow author and I have come to agree with commenters that the term "complex matroids" used there was a poor choice, since it suggests matroids realizable over the complex numbers.

F-matroids and will state the most fundamental results – in particular, cryptomorphisms between these new axiomatizations and those in [Bak16] for F-matroids (Theorem 2.17). These results are proved in Section 3. Section 4 discusses how various matroid properties – such as duality, deletion, and contraction – play out for vectors and covectors. This section has some distressing surprises: several properties that we use often in the context of oriented matroid and of subspaces of vector spaces fail to hold for general F-matroids. Section 5 explores some specific examples.

Sections 6 and 7 address the discrepancy between the vector axioms for F-matroids and those for oriented matroids. The Composition Axiom does not hold for general F-matroids: Section 6 discusses the potential role of operations similar to composition with respect to various hyperfields, including many of those introduced by Viro. It is not known whether the Elimination Axiom holds for general F-matroids. For general F-matroids, one can conjecture both weaker and stronger variations on Elimination of obvious interest, and for many F it is unknown whether any of these variations hold.

Acknowledgements. Many thanks to Matt Baker, Emanuele Delucchi, Chris Eppolito, and Thomas Zaslavsky for helpful discussions. Thanks also to Ting Su for comments and corrections.

1. Background

This section will very briefly review definitions from Baker's paper ([Bak16]), but only as a reminder to the reader who has already read the more complete treatment there.

Notation 1.1. Throughout E denotes a finite set. F denotes a hyperfield. $F^\times$ denotes $F - \{0\}$.

$\mathbf{0}$ denotes the vector in F^E with all components 0.

The **support** of $X \in F^E$ is $\underline{X} := \{e \in E : X(e) \neq 0\}$. The **zero set** of X is $X^0 := \{e \in E : X(e) = 0\}$.

The letter i will always denote $\sqrt{-1}$.

If $X \in F^E$ and $e \in E$ then $X \backslash e$ denote the restriction of X to $E - \{e\}$. If $f \notin E$ and $\alpha \in F$ then Xf^α denotes the extension of X to $E \cup \{f\}$ with $X(f) = \alpha$.

For any $S \subseteq F^E$, Minsupp(S) denotes the set of elements of S of minimal support.

1.1. Hyperfields.

Definition 1.2. A **hyperoperation** on a set R is a map $\boxplus$ from $R \times R$ to the set of nonempty subsets of R.

If $a, b, c \in R$ then $(a \boxplus b) \boxplus c$ is defined to be $\bigcup_{x \in a \boxplus b} x \boxplus c$. Likewise define $a \boxplus (b \boxplus c)$.

As in [Bak16], all hyperoperations in this paper will be commutative and associative. Thus for any finite $S \subseteq R$ the sum $\boxplus_{s \in S} s$ is well-defined, with $\boxplus_{s \in \emptyset} s$ defined to be $\{0\}$.

Definition 1.3 ([Bak16])**.** A (commutative) **hypergroup** is a tuple $(G, \boxplus, 0)$, where $\boxplus$ is a commutative and associative hyperoperation on G such that

(1) $0 \boxplus x = \{x\}$ for all $x \in G$.

(2) For every $x \in G$ there is a unique element of G, denoted $-x$, such that $0 \in x \boxplus -x$.
(3) For all x, y, and z, $x \in y \boxplus z$ if and only if $z \in x \boxplus (-y)$.

A (commutative) **hyperring** is a tuple $(R, \odot, \boxplus, 1, 0)$ such that

(1) $(R, \odot, 1)$ is a commutative monoid.
(2) $(R, \boxplus, 0)$ is a commutative hypergroup.
(3) $0 \odot x = x \odot 0 = 0$ for all $x \in R$.
(4) $a \odot (x \boxplus y) = (a \odot x) \boxplus (a \odot y)$ for all $a, x, y \in R$

A hyperring F is a **hyperfield** if $0 \neq 1$ and every non-zero element of F has a multiplicative inverse.

An observation that comes up frequently:

Lemma 1.4. *[cf. Lemma 2.3 in* [Bak16]*] If $(G, \boxplus, 0)$ is a hypergroup, $S \subseteq G$ is finite and $x \in G$ then $x \in \boxplus_{y \in S} y$ if and only if $0 \in -x \boxplus \boxplus_{y \in S} y$.*

If F is a hyperfield, then F^E has a hypergroup structure given by

$$X \boxplus Y := \{Z : \forall e \ Z(e) \in X(e) \boxplus Y(e)\}.$$

F acts on F^E by componentwise multiplication. (Formally, F^E is an F-module (cf. 2.18 in [Bak16]).)

Definition 1.5 ([Bak16])**.** Let R be a hyperring equipped with an automorphism c such that $c^2 = \mathrm{id}$. Denote the image of $x \in R$ under c by x^c. For $X, Y \in R^E$, the **inner product** is defined as

$$X \odot Y := \boxplus_{e \in E} X(e) \odot Y(e)^c.$$

We say X and Y are **orthogonal**, denoted $X \perp Y$, if $0 \in X \odot Y$. If $S \subseteq R^E$, we denote by $S^\perp$ the set of all $X \in R^E$ such that $X \perp Y$ for all $Y \in S$.

We will always view a hyperfield as being equipped with c. When no c is specified, we will take $c = \mathrm{id}$.

Example 1.6. Viro's paper [Vir10] provides an excellent introduction to and motivation for hyperfields. Several of the following hyperfields were first introduced there.

Notice that several of these hyperfields have hyperfield operations defined in terms of the usual field operations on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$. The symbol $+$, when denoting a binary operation, always denotes the usual addition.

(1) The field $\mathbb{R}$ is a hyperfield, with $c = \mathrm{id}$
(2) The field $\mathbb{C}$ is a hyperfield, with c being conjugation.
(3) The **Krasner hyperfield** $\mathbb{K}$ on elements $\{0, 1\}$ is the unique two-element hyperfield for which $1 \boxplus 1 = \{0, 1\}$. The automorphism c is the identity.
(4) The **sign hyperfield** $\mathbb{S}$ on elements $\{0, +, -\}$ has addition $0 \boxplus x = \{x\}$ for all x, $x \boxplus x = \{x\}$ for all x, and $+ \boxplus - = \{0, +, -\}$. Multiplication is given by $0 \odot x = 0$ for all x, $+ \odot + = - \odot - = +$, and $+ \odot - = -$. The automorphism c is the identity.

(5) Let S^1 denote the unit circle in $\mathbb{C}$. For $x \in \mathbb{C}$, the **phase** of x is

$$\mathrm{ph}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ \frac{x}{|x|} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The **phase hyperfield** Φ on elements $S^1 \cup \{0\}$ has addition $x \boxplus y := \{\mathrm{ph}(ax + by) : a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$ and has multiplication inherited from $\mathbb{C}$. The automorphism c is conjugation. (For nonzero x we have $x^c = x^{-1}$, and in [AD12] the inner product is described in this way.)

This is not the hyperfield which gets the name "phase hyperfield" in [Vir10]: see 9 below.

(6) ([Vir10]) The **triangle hyperfield** $\triangle$ on elements $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ has addition $x \boxplus y := \{z : |x - y| \leq z \leq x + y\}$ and has multiplication inherited from $\mathbb{R}$. The automorphism c is the identity.

(7) ([Vir10]) The **tropical real hyperfield** $\mathbb{TR}$ on elements $\mathbb{R}$ has addition

$$x \boxplus y := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x| > |y| \text{ or } x = y \\ y & \text{if } |x| < |y| \\ \{z : |z| \leq |x|\} & \text{if } x = -y \end{cases}$$

and has multiplication inherited from $\mathbb{R}$. The automorphism c is the identity.

(8) ([Vir10]) The **tropical complex hyperfield** $\mathbb{TC}$ on elements $\mathbb{C}$ has addition

$$x \boxplus y := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x| > |y| \\ y & \text{if } |x| < |y| \\ \{|x| \, \mathrm{ph}(ax + by) : a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} & \text{if } |x| = |y| \text{ and } x \neq -y \\ \{z : |z| \leq |x|\} & \text{if } x = -y \end{cases}$$

and has multiplication inherited from $\mathbb{C}$. The automorphism c is conjugation.

(9) ([Vir10]) The **tropical phase hyperfield** $\mathbb{T}\Phi$ on elements $S^1 \cup \{0\}$ (called the *phase hyperfield* in [Vir10]) has addition

$$x \boxplus y := \begin{cases} S^1 \cup \{0\} & \text{if } x = -y \neq 0 \\ \{\mathrm{ph}(ax + by) : a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and has multiplication inherited from $\mathbb{C}$. The automorphism c is conjugation.

(10) ([Vir10]) The **ultratriangle hyperfield** $\mathbb{T}\triangle$ on elements $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ has addition

$$x \boxplus y = \begin{cases} \max(x, y) & \text{if } x \neq y \\ \{z : z \leq x\} & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$$

and has multiplication inherited from $\mathbb{R}$. The automorphism c is the identity.

Definition 1.7. A **morphism of hyperfields** is a function $f : F \to F'$ such that, for all $x, y \in F$,

$$f(x \odot y) = f(x) \odot f(y)$$
$$f(x \boxplus y) \subseteq f(x) \boxplus f(y)$$

and

$$f(x^c) = (f(x))^{c'}$$

where c and c' denote the involutions associated to F resp. F'.

We will also use f to denote the induced componentwise map $F^E \to (F')^E$.

Example 1.8. (1) The inclusion $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a morphism of hyperfields.
(2) For every hyperfield F the function $\kappa : F \to \mathbb{K}$ sending each nonzero element of F to 1 is a morphism of hyperfields.
(3) The function $\mathrm{ph} : \mathbb{C} \to \Phi$ introduced in Example 1.6.5 is a morphism of hyperfields. It restricts to a morphism $\mathrm{sign} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{S}$.
(4) Other morphisms which are interesting but will not be considered further here include
   (a) $\mathbb{C} \to \triangle$ taking each $x \in \mathbb{C}$ to $|x|$
   (b) $\mathrm{sign} : \mathbb{TR} \to \mathbb{S}$
   (c) $\mathrm{ph} : \mathbb{TC} \to \mathbb{T}\Phi$
   (d) $\mathbb{TC} \to \mathbb{T}\triangle$ taking each $x \in \mathbb{TC}$ to $|x|$

1.2. **Matroids over hyperfields.**

Definition 1.9 ([Del11], Definition 3)**.** Let E be a set, and let C be a collection of pairwise incomparable nonempty subsets of E. We say that $X, Y \in C$ form a **modular pair** in C if $X \neq Y$ and $X \cup Y$ does not properly contain a union of two distinct elements of C.

Definition 1.10 ([Bak16])**.** Let E be a nonempty finite set, F a hyperfield, and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq F^E$. $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of **F-circuits of an F-matroid on** E if $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies all of the following axioms.

(1) $\mathbf{0} \notin \mathcal{C}$.
(2) (Symmetry) If $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\alpha \in F^\times$ then $\alpha X \in \mathcal{C}$.
(3) (Incomparability) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\underline{X} \subseteq \underline{Y}$ then there exists $\alpha \in F^\times$ such that $X = \alpha Y$.
(4) (Modular Elimination) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$, $\underline{X}$, $\underline{Y}$ form a modular pair in $\{\underline{A} : A \in \mathcal{C}\}$, and $e \in E$ such that $X(e) = -Y(e) \neq 0$ then there exists $Z \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $Z(e) = 0$ and $Z(f) \in X(f) \boxplus Y(f)$ for all $f \in E$.

Theorem 1.11 (Theorem 3.15 in [Bak16])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the F-circuit set of an F-matroid. Then $\mathcal{C}^* := \mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{C}^\perp - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ is also the F-circuit set of an F-matroid, and $(\mathcal{C}^*)^* = \mathcal{C}$.*

An **F-matroid** is the information encoded in a set of F-circuits. Thus an F-matroid $\mathcal{M}$ has an associated pair $(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}))$. $\mathcal{C}(M)$ is the set of **F-circuits of $\mathcal{M}$**, and $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ is the set of **F-cocircuits of $\mathcal{M}$**. The F-matroid with F-circuit set $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ and F-cocircuit set $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ is called the **dual** to $\mathcal{M}$ and is denoted $\mathcal{M}^*$.

Remark 1.12. Baker gives another characterization of F-matroids as well, via *Grassmann-Plücker functions*, which generalize chirotopes of oriented matroids.

Example 1.13. Matroids in the usual sense are essentially $\mathbb{K}$-matroids. Specifically, if $S \subseteq E$ let $X_S \in \mathbb{K}^E$ be the indicator function for S (so $X_S(e) = 1$ if and only if $e \in S$). Then $C \subseteq 2^E$ is the set of circuits of a matroid in the usual sense if and only if $\{X_S : S \in C\}$ is the set of $\mathbb{K}$-circuits of a $\mathbb{K}$-matroid (Corollary 1 in [Del11]).

When we refer to a *matroid* without modification, we mean a matroid in the traditional sense – an object, e.g., with circuits which are subsets of E. When we wish to use the language of matroids over hyperfields, we will talk about $\mathbb{K}$-matroids.

Example 1.14. $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^E$ is the set of $\mathbb{S}$-circuits of an $\mathbb{S}$-matroid if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of signed circuits of an oriented matroid. This follows from Corollary 1 in [Del11] together with Theorem 3.6.1 in [BLVS$^+$99].

Example 1.15. Φ-matroids are the same thing as phased matroids (cf. [AD12]).

Example 1.16. If K is a field, then $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq K^E$ satisfies the K-circuit axioms if and only if $\mathcal{C}^* = \text{Minsupp}(V - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ for some linear subspace V of K^E ([Bak16]). We call the K-matroid with K-cocircuit set $\mathcal{C}^*$ the **K-matroid corresponding to V.**

Proposition 1.17 ([Bak16])**.** *A morphism $f : F \to F'$ of hyperfields induces a map f_* from F-matroids to F'-matroids so that*

$$\mathcal{C}(f_*(\mathcal{M})) = \{\alpha f(X) : X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}), \alpha \in (F')^\times\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}^*(f_*(\mathcal{M})) = \{\alpha f(X) : X \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}), \alpha \in (F')^\times\}.$$

Example 1.18. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an F-matroid then the ordinary matroid corresponding to $\kappa_*(\mathcal{M})$ is called the **underlying matroid** of $\mathcal{M}$.

Since underlying matroids are well-defined, we can refer to classical matroid properties of an F-matroid, e.g. bases and circuits. (A circuit of an F-matroid $\mathcal{M}$ is a circuit of the underlying matroid, hence is the support of an F-circuit of $\mathcal{M}$.)

Corollary 1.19. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is an F-matroid then there is a bijection $F^\times X \to \underline{X}$ from the set of $F^\times$-orbits of circuits of $\mathcal{M}$ to the set of circuits of the underlying matroid.*

2. Main Theorem: F-vectors

This section introduces our new axiomatization of F-matroids. The idea is to generalize the following vision of subspaces of a vector space: let K be a field and V the row space of a matrix M over K with columns indexed by E. A subset B of E is a basis of the K-matroid corresponding to V if and only if the set of columns indexed by B is a basis for the column space. In this case M is equivalent by row operations to a matrix M_B such that the submatrix of M_B with columns indexed by B is an identity matrix. We call M_B a *reduced row-echelon form for M with respect to B*. A necessary condition for an element X of K^E to be in V is that X must be a linear combination of the rows of M_B.

Let $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ denote the set of rows of M_B, where R_j is the unique element of V such that for all $k \in B$, $R_j(k) = \delta_{jk}$. (Here δ_{jk} denotes the Kronecker delta.) Our condition for X to be in V is that $X = \sum_{j \in B} X(j) R_j$.

Our generalization of rows in reduced-row-echelon-form matrices is F-cocircuits, and our definition of F-covectors is vectors satisfying the above condition (with hypersum $\boxplus$ in place of sum) with respect to every basis. But in order to get a stand-alone definition of F-vectors and F-covectors, we first need to define bases without reference to circuits or cocircuits.

Definition 2.1. Let F be a hyperfield, E a finite set, and $\mathcal{W} \subseteq F^E$. A **support basis** of $\mathcal{W}$ is a minimal $B \subseteq E$ such that $B \cap \underline{X} \neq \emptyset$ for every $X \in \mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

Lemma 2.2. *1. The set of support bases of $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of support bases of* $\text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$.

2. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an F-matroid on E and $B \subseteq E$ then B is a basis for $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if B is a support basis for $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. (1) is clear. (2) follows from 2.1.16 in [Oxl92]. □

Definition 2.3. Let B be a support basis for $\mathcal{W}$. A **weakly reduced row-echelon form** for $\mathcal{W}$ with respect to B is a subset $\{S_j : j \in B\}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ such that $\underline{S_j} \cap B = \{j\}$ for each $j \in B$. A **reduced row-echelon form** for $\mathcal{W}$ with respect to B is a weakly reduced row-echelon form $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ such that $R_j(k) = \delta_{jk}$ for each $j, k \in B$.

In other words, a reduced row-echelon form is a weakly reduced row-echelon form $\{S_j : j \in B\}$ such that $S_j(j) = 1$ for every j.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{W} \subseteq F^E$ and B a support basis.*

1. *$\mathcal{W}$ has at least one weakly reduced row-echelon form with respect to B.*
2. *If $\mathcal{W}$ is closed under multiplication by $F^\times$ then $\mathcal{W}$ has at least one reduced row-echelon form with respect to B.*
3. *$\{S_j : j \in B\} \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ is a (weakly) reduced row-echelon form for $\mathcal{W}$ if and only if it is also a (weakly) reduced row-echelon form for* $\mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$.

The proof is straightforward.

Lemma 2.5. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is an F-matroid then, for every basis B, $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ has a unique reduced row-echelon form with respect to B.*

This follows from the following lemma, which introduces the idea of **fundamental F-circuit** $FC(e, B)$ and **fundamental F-cocircuit** $FC^*(e, B)$. The reduced row-echelon form of Lemma 2.5 is $\{FC^*(j, B) : j \in B\}$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid and B a basis for $\mathcal{M}$.*

1. *If $e \in E - B$ then there is a unique element of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$, denoted $FC(e, B)$, such that $\underline{FC(e, B)} \subseteq B \cup \{e\}$ and $FC(e, B)(e) = 1$.*
2. *If $j \in B$ then there is a unique element of $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$, denoted $FC^*(j, B)$, such that $\underline{FC^*(j, B)} \subseteq (E - B) \cup \{j\}$ and $FC^*(j, B)(e) = 1$.*
3. *If $X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ and $e \in \underline{X}$ then there is a basis B' for $\mathcal{M}$ such that X is a scalar multiple of $FC(e, B')$.*

Proof. 1. An elementary result of matroid theory (cf. 1.2.6 in [Oxl92]) says that there is a unique circuit $C(e, B)$ of the underlying matroid of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $e \in C(e, B) \subseteq B \cup \{e\}$. By Proposition 1.17 there is an element of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ with support $C(e, B)$, and by Symmetry and Incomparability there is a unique such element with value 1 on e.

The proof of (2) is similar.

The proof of (3) follows from a standard matroid theory result: $\underline{X} - \{e\}$ is independent in $\mathcal{M}$, hence extends to a basis B'. Uniqueness of $C(e, B')$ implies that $\underline{X} = C(e, B')$, and so the result follows from Corollary 1.19. □

Definition 2.7. Let $X, Y_1, \ldots, Y_k \in F^E$. We say X is a **linear combination of** $\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_k\}$ if there are $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \in F$ such that $X \in \coprod_{j=1}^k \alpha_j Y_j$.

The following is easy but is important enough to make it a lemma:

Lemma 2.8. *If $B \subseteq E$ and $\{R_j : j \in B\} \subseteq F^E$ satisfies $R_j(k) = \delta_{jk}$ for all $k \in B$ then $X \in F^E$ is a linear combination of $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ if and only if, for each $e \in E$,*

$$X(e) \in \coprod_{j \in B} X(j)R_j(e) = \coprod_{j \in B \cap \underline{X}} X(j)R_j(e).$$

Definition 2.9 (**Hyperfield vector axiom).** Let F be a hyperfield, E a finite set, and $\mathcal{W} \subseteq F^E$. $\mathcal{W}$ is an **F-vector set** if $\mathcal{W}$ is exactly the set of all $X \in F^E$ such that, for every support basis B and every weakly reduced row echelon form $\{S_j : j \in B\}$ with respect to B, X is a linear combination of $\{S_j : j \in B\}$.

We make this the definition for the sake of brevity, but it is easy to verify the following equivalent characterization:

Proposition 2.10 (**Hyperfield vector axiom, second form).** *Let F be a hyperfield, E a finite set, and $\mathcal{W} \subseteq F^E$. $\mathcal{W}$ is an F-vector set if and only if*

1. *$\mathcal{W}$ has a reduced row-echelon form $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ with respect to each support basis B, and*
2. *$\mathcal{W}$ is exactly the set of $X \in F^E$ such that, for every support basis B, X is a linear combination of $\{R_j : j \in B\}$.*

Proposition 2.11. *When $\mathcal{W}$ is an F-vector set and B is a support basis then the reduced row-echelon form $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ is unique.*

Proof. If $S_j \in \mathcal{W}$ satisfies $S_j(k) = \delta_{jk}$ for all $k \in B$, then by Lemma 2.8, for every e, $S_j(e) \in \coprod_{k \in B \cap \underline{S_j}} S_j(k) R_k(e) = R_k(e)$. □

For any subset $\mathcal{S}$ of F^E for which reduced-row-echelon forms are unique, we will always use $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ to denote the reduced row-echelon form for $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to B. Both F-vector sets and F-cocircuit sets of F-matroids are examples of such $\mathcal{S}$.

Example 2.12. Corollary 5.3 will show that when $F = \mathbb{S}$ this definition coincides with the standard definition of signed vectors of an oriented matroid (cf. 3.7.5 in [BLVS$^+$99]).

For general F, if $\mathcal{W} \subseteq F^E$ satisfies the hyperfield vector axioms then $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ satisfies an analog to the Symmetry Axiom for oriented matroids (Lemma 3.1). In general $\mathcal{W}$ need not satisfy the Composition Axiom (see Section 6.2). Whether an analog to the Elimination Axiom holds for general F-vector sets is unknown – see Section 7 for more discussion.

Definition 2.13. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid and $X \in F^E$. We say X is **consistent** with $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ if, for each basis B, X is a linear combination of $\{R_j : j \in B\}$.

The following is obvious, but useful enough to state as a lemma.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset F^E$, and let $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ contain at least one representative from each $F^\times$ orbit in $\mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{C}^\perp = S^\perp$.*

In particular (Lemma 2.6), to show that an $X \in F^E$ is in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$, it is enough to show that $X \perp FC(e, B)$ for every B and e.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid and $X \in F^E$. Then $X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$ if and only if X is consistent with $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. We will show $X \perp FC(e, B)$ if and only if $X(e) \in \coprod_{j \in B \cap \underline{X}} X(j) R_j(e)$. It then follows that $X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$ if and only if, for every basis B, $X \in \coprod_{j \in B \cap \underline{X}} X(j) R_j$, and this is equivalent to X being a linear combination of $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ by Lemma 2.8.

Let $X \in F^E$ and $Y = FC(e, B) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ for some basis B and some e. Consider $\{R_j : j \in B\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$, the reduced row-echelon form with respect to B. Since $R_j \perp Y$ and $\underline{R_j} \cap \underline{Y} \subseteq \{j, e\}$, we have that if $j \in \underline{Y}$ then

$$0 \in R_j(e)Y(e)^c \boxplus R_j(j)Y(j)^c = R_j(e)Y(e)^c \boxplus Y(j)^c$$

and so $Y(j)^c = -R_j(e)Y(e)^c$. Further, if $j \in B - \underline{Y}$ then since $Y(e) \neq 0$ we have that $R_j(e) = 0$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} X \odot Y &= \bigboxplus_{j \in \underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}} X(j)Y(j)^c \\ &= X(e)Y(e)^c \boxplus \bigboxplus_{j \in B \cap \underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}} -X(j)R_j(e)Y(e)^c \\ &= (X(e) \boxplus \bigboxplus_{j \in B \cap \underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}} -X(j)R_j(e))Y(e)^c \end{aligned}$$

and so $X \perp Y$ if and only if $0 \in X(e) \boxplus \bigboxplus_{j \in B \cap \underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}} -X(j)R_j(e)$. By Lemma 1.4 this is true if and only if $X(e) \in \bigboxplus_{j \in B \cap \underline{X} \cap \underline{Y}} X(j)R_j(e)$. Since $R_j(e) = 0$ for every $j \in B - \underline{Y}$, we have that $X \perp Y$ if and only if $X(e) \in \bigboxplus_{j \in B \cap \underline{X}} X(j)R_j(e)$.

□

Definition 2.16. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid.

The set $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ of F**-covectors** of $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ is the set of all elements of F^E which are consistent with $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$.

The set $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$ of F**-vectors** of $\mathcal{M}$ is $(\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}))^\perp$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$ is the set of all elements of F^E which are consistent with $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$.

Theorem 2.17. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is an F-matroid then $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ are F-vector sets (in the sense of Definition 2.9).*

Further, every F-vector set is $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ for some F-matroid $\mathcal{M}$, and

$$\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) - \{\mathbf{0}\})$$

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{Minsupp}((\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}))^\perp - \{\mathbf{0}\}).$$

The characterization of F-matroids by F-covectors solidifies the assertion from the introduction that "the concept of matroids over a hyperfield generalizes the concept of linear subspaces of a vector space". Previously this assertion rested on Grassmann-Plücker functions ([Bak16]), but the discussion at the beginning of this section proves the following proposition:

Proposition 2.18. *Let K be a field and V a rank r subspace of K^E. Then there is a K-matroid $\mathcal{M}$ such that*

1. $V = \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$
2. $V^\perp = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$, *and*
3. *The projective coordinates of the Plücker embedding for V constitute a Grassmann-Plücker function for $\mathcal{M}$.*

Further, every K-matroid arises in this way.

Thus in this special case the Grassmann-Plücker function $\varphi_{\mathcal{M}}$ of a K-matroid $\mathcal{M}$ can be viewed as an element of $\mathbb{P}(\bigwedge^r K^{\binom{E}{r}})$ of the form $[v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_r]$, where $\{v_1, \ldots, v_r\}$ is a basis for the vector space $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. The algebraic structure of the exterior algebra $\bigwedge^r K^{\binom{E}{r}}$ gives a lovely relationship between $\varphi_{\mathcal{M}}$ and the vector space $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$:

$$X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) \Leftrightarrow X \wedge \varphi_{\mathcal{M}} = 0.$$

This begs for generalization to other hyperfields, and such a generalization has been accomplished for hyperfields arising from an idempotent semifield by Jeffrey and Noah Giansiracusa [GG15]. The hyperfields $\mathbb{K}$ and $\mathbb{T}\triangle$ are examples of such fields. Their paper is not written in the language of matroids over hyperfields, but the cryptomorphism 3.10 in [Bak16] allows one to characterize Proposition 4.2.1 in [GG15] as: for a hyperfield F arising from an idempotent semifield and a rank r F-matroid $\mathcal{M}$, there is an associated graded "tropical Grassmann algebra" $\bigwedge \mathcal{M}$ such that $\varphi_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathbb{P}(\bigwedge^r \mathcal{M})$ and, for all $X \in F^E$,

$$X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp \Leftrightarrow X \wedge \varphi_{\mathcal{M}} = 0.$$

Problem 2.19. Are there similar generalizations for other hyperfields?

Remark 2.20. The role of reduced row-echelon forms in Definition 2.9 may seem like overkill. One might hope for a definition that says, for every maximal linearly independent subset S of $\mathcal{W}$, every element of $\mathcal{W}$ has a unique expression as a linear combination of S. Sadly, this is not equivalent to Definition 2.9, as will be illustrated by an example in Section 5.4.2.

Remark 2.21. Baker [Bak16] defined "linear subspaces" of F-matroids, given the existence of a partial demifield (F, S). His linear subspaces constitute another approach to generalizing signed vectors and covectors of an oriented matroid, and when they exist they have good properties that we do not know to hold for F-vector sets, e.g. an Elimination Axiom. However, not every hyperfield can be associated to a partial demifield, and even when we have a partial demifield (F, S), not every F-matroid has an associated linear subspace. He calls F such that F-matroids have well-behaved linear subspaces *vectorial*. When F is vectorial, it is clear that the linear subspace associated to an F-matroid $\mathcal{M}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$.

3. Proof of Theorem 2.17

We begin by proving that if $\mathcal{W}$ is an F-vector set then $\text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ satisfies the F-circuit axioms.

Lemma 3.1. *[Symmetry for F-vector sets] If $\mathcal{W} \subseteq F^E$ satisfies the hyperfield vector axioms, $X \in \mathcal{W}$, and $\alpha \in F$ then $\alpha X \in \mathcal{W}$.*

Proof. If B is a support basis and $X \in \coprod_{j \in B} \beta_j R_j$ then $\alpha X \in \coprod_{j \in B} \alpha\beta_j R_j$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an F-vector set.*

1. If $X \in \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ and $b \in \underline{X}$ then there is a support basis B containing b such that X is a multiple of R_b.

2. If $X, Y \in \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$, $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ form a modular pair in $\{\underline{A} : A \in \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})\}$, $b_X \in \underline{X} - \underline{Y}$, and $b_Y \in \underline{Y} - \underline{X}$ then there is a support basis $B \supseteq \{b_X, b_Y\}$ such that X is a multiple of R_{b_X} and Y is a multiple of R_{b_Y}.

Proof. 1. There is no $Z \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $X^0 \cup \{b\} \subseteq Z^0$, since otherwise X does not have minimal support. Thus $X^0 \cup \{b\}$ contains a basis B which has b as an element, and uniqueness of reduced row echelon forms (Proposition 2.11) implies $R_b = X(b)^{-1}X$.

2. If $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ form a modular pair, this implies that if $Z \in \mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ and $Z^0 \supset X^0 \cap Y^0$ then $\underline{Z} = \underline{X}$ or $\underline{Z} = \underline{Y}$. Thus $(X^0 \cap Y^0) \cup \{b_X, b_Y\}$ contains a basis B, and B contains b_X and b_Y. Uniqueness of reduced row echelon forms then implies $R_{b_X} = X(b_X)^{-1}X$ and $R_{b_Y} = Y(b_Y)^{-1}Y$. □

Lemma 3.3. *If $\mathcal{W}$ is an F-vector set then* $\mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ *satisfies Symmetry and Incomparability.*

Proof. Symmetry follows from Lemma 3.1.

To see Incomparability: let $X, Y \in \mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ such that $\underline{X} \subseteq \underline{Y}$, and let $b \in \underline{X}$. By definition $\underline{X} = \underline{Y}$. Consider a basis B contained in $X^0 \cup \{b\}$. This exists by Lemma 3.2, and also by Lemma 3.2 $X = X(b)R_b$ and $Y = Y(b)R_b$. Thus $X = X(b)Y(b)^{-1}Y$.

□

The following is the closest thing we currently have to an Elimination Axiom for F-vector sets.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an F-vector set, $X \in \mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$, $Y \in \mathcal{W}$, and $e \in E$ such that $X(e) = -Y(e) \neq 0$ and $X \neq -Y$. Let B be a support basis contained in $X^0 \cup \{e\}$, $r = |B|$, and $k = |B \cap \underline{Y}|$. Then there exists $\{Z_1, \ldots, Z_{k-1}\} \subset \mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ such that for each j*

(1) $Z_j(e) = 0$ *and*
(2) $(X \boxplus Y) \cap \coprod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Our Z_j will be the $Y(j')R_{j'}$ such that $j' \in (B \cap \underline{Y}) - \{e\}$. Certainly these satisfy $Z_j(e) = 0$. Also, by Lemma 2.8, for every $f \in E$

$$Y(f) \in Y(e)R_e(f) \boxplus \coprod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j(f).$$

$$= -X(e)R_e(f) \boxplus \coprod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j(f).$$

But $R_e = X(e)^{-1}X$, so

$$Y(f) \in -X(f) \boxplus A(f) \qquad \text{for some } A(f) \in \coprod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j(f)$$

and so by Lemma 1.4

$$A(f) \in X(f) \boxplus Y(f).$$

This defines $A \in (X \boxplus Y) \cap \coprod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j$. □

Together with Lemma 3.2 this gives us the last step to prove that $\mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ is an F-circuit set.

Lemma 3.5. *If $\mathcal{W}$ is an F-vector set then* $\mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ *satisfies the F-circuit axioms.*

Proof. Lemma 3.3 proved everything except Modular Elimination. Let $X, Y \in \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ be a modular pair and $e \in E$ such that $X(e) = -Y(e) \neq 0$. Choose $b_X \in \underline{X} - \underline{Y}$ and $b_Y \in \underline{Y} - \underline{X}$, and apply Proposition 3.4 with the support basis B given by Lemma 3.2.2 to get $Z_1 \in \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$ such that $Z_1(e) = 0$ and $Z_1 \in X \boxplus Y$. □

We now complete the proof of Theorem 2.17.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$, and so $\text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) - \{\mathbf{0}\}) = \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp - \{\mathbf{0}\})$, which is $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ by definition of $\mathcal{C}^*$. $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ has a reduced row-echelon form with respect to every basis, by Lemmas 2.4.3 and 2.5, and by definition $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ is the set of all X that are linear combinations of $\{R_j : j \in B\}$ for all B. Thus $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies the second form of the Hyperfield Vector Axiom. By duality, $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}^*)$ does as well.

Lemma 3.5 showed that if $\mathcal{W}$ is an F-vector set then $\text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\}) = \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ for some $\mathcal{M}$. Thus, by Lemma 2.2, the set of support bases of $\mathcal{W}$ is exactly the set of bases of $\mathcal{M}$, and so the definition of $\mathcal{W}$ tells us that $\mathcal{W}$ is exactly the set of elements of F^E that are consistent with $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$. Thus by definition $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$.

Finally, to see that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W}^\perp - \{\mathbf{0}\})$: since $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$, we have $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{W}^\perp - \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Thus it suffices to show that if $X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$, $Y \in \mathcal{W}^\perp - \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and $\underline{Y} \subseteq \underline{X}$, then $Y = \alpha X$ for some $\alpha \in F^\times$. Let $e \in \underline{Y}$ and $f \in \underline{X} - \{e\}$. Then Lemma 2.6 says that X is a multiple of $FC(f, B)$ for some basis B. This B contains e, and so the reduced row-echelon form $\{R_j : j \in B\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ contains an element R_e. Note $\underline{R_e} \cap \underline{X} = \{e, f\}$. Thus $e \in \underline{Y} \cap \underline{R_e} \subseteq \{e, f\}$, and so orthogonality of Y and R_e implies that $Y(e) = Y(e)R_e(e)^c = -Y(f)R_e(f)^c$. Likewise $X(e) = X(e)R_e(e)^c = -X(f)R_e(f)^c$, and so

$$-\frac{1}{R_e(f)^c} = \frac{X(f)}{X(e)} = \frac{Y(f)}{Y(e)}$$

$$Y(f) = \frac{Y(e)}{X(e)} X(f)$$

and so $Y = \frac{Y(e)}{X(e)} X$. □

4. Basic properties

4.1. **Duality.** Our results so far show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp \supseteq \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$. If F is a field then the inclusion $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) \supseteq \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$ is an equality: this is just ordinary orthogonality of vector spaces. This is also the case if $F = \mathbb{S}$ (the oriented matroid case) – see Example 6.11.

However, in general $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$ might be a proper subset of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})^*$. This will be shown by an example with $F = \Phi$ in Section 5.4.4.

4.2. **Deletion and contraction.** Baker ([Bak16]) defined deletion and contraction of F-matroids in a way consistent with matroid and oriented matroid definitions:

Theorem 4.1 ([Bak16], 3.18)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid on E, and let $A \subseteq E$. Then $\{X \backslash A : X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})\}$ is the set of circuits of an F-matroid $\mathcal{M}/A$, called the* **contraction** *of $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to A, and $\{X \backslash A : X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}), \underline{X} \cap A = \emptyset\}$ is the set of circuits of and F-matroid $\mathcal{M} \backslash A$, called the* **deletion** *of $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to A. Moreover, $(M/A)^* = M \backslash A$ and $(M \backslash A)^* = M/A$.*

It turns out that the covector interpretation of contraction is straightforward, while deletion is more problematic.

Proposition 4.2. $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}/e) = \{X : Xe^0 \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$

Proof. By Theorem 2.17, $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$. Thus for $X \in F^{E-\{e\}}$

$$\begin{aligned} Xe^0 \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) &\Leftrightarrow Xe^0 \perp Y \ \forall Y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow X \perp (Y\backslash e) \ \forall Y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) \\ &\Leftrightarrow X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}/e)^\perp \\ &\Leftrightarrow X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}/e) \end{aligned}$$ □

In contrast to the situation with matroids and oriented matroids, *it is not always true that* $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash e) = \{X\backslash e : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$. This is illustrated by an example in Section 5.4.5. The best we can say is the following.

Proposition 4.3. $\{X\backslash e : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash e)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}\backslash e) = \{X\backslash e : X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}), X(e) = 0\}$. Thus if $Y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$ then $Y\backslash e \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}\backslash e)^\perp$. □

Problem 4.4. Find a direct characterization of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash e)$ in terms of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ for arbitrary matroids over hyperfields.

Problem 4.5. Characterize the hyperfields F such that, for all F-matroids $\mathcal{M}$ and elements e of $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash e) = \{X\backslash e : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$.

4.3. **Morphisms of hyperfields.**

Proposition 4.6. *If $f : F \to F'$ is a morphism of hyperfields and $\mathcal{M}$ is an F-matroid then $\mathcal{V}(f_*(\mathcal{M})) \supseteq \{\alpha f(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}), \alpha \in (F')^\times\}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 1.17, $\mathcal{C}^*(f_*(\mathcal{M})) = \{\alpha f(Y) : Y \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}), \alpha \in (F')^\times\}$. Also, if $X, Y \in F^E$ and $X \perp Y$ then $f(X) \perp f(Y)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{C}^*(f_*(\mathcal{M})))^\perp &= \{\alpha f(Y) : Y \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}), \alpha \in (F')^\times\}^\perp \\ &\supseteq \{\alpha f(X) : X \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})^\perp, \alpha \in (F')^\times\} \\ &= \{\alpha f(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}), \alpha \in (F')^\times\} \end{aligned}$$ □

In general, equality will not hold. For instance, consider the inclusion $\eta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ and an $\mathbb{R}$-matroid $\mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$ a two-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ spanned by $\{v, w\}$. Then $\{\alpha\eta(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}), \alpha \in \mathbb{C}^\times\}$ has topological dimension 3 in $\mathbb{C}^n$, but $\mathcal{V}(\eta_*(\mathcal{M}))$ is the complexification of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$, hence is a rank 2 linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$, hence has topological dimension 4.

A bit more surprisingly, equality need not hold even when the morphism is surjective:

Example 4.7. Consider the hyperfield morphism $\mathrm{ph} : \mathbb{C} \to \Phi$ and the $\mathbb{C}$-matroids $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ with

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathrm{Row}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1+i & 1 & 0 \\ 1+i & 3i & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_2) = \mathrm{Row}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1+i & 1 & 0 \\ 1+i & 4i & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

As shown in [AD12],

$$\{\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}_1)\} = \{\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}_2)\}$$

but

$$\{\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_1)\} \not\subseteq \{\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_2)\}.$$

Thus $\mathrm{ph}_*(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathrm{ph}_*(\mathcal{M}_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}^*(\mathrm{ph}_*(\mathcal{M}_1)) &\supseteq \{\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_1)\} \cup \{\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_2)\} \text{ by Proposition 4.6}\\ &\supsetneq \{\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_2)\}\\ &= \{\alpha\,\mathrm{ph}(X) : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_2), \alpha \in \Phi^\times\}.\end{aligned}$$

4.4. **Loops and coloops.**

Definition 4.8. A **loop** resp. **coloop** of an F-matroid is a loop resp. coloop of the underlying matroid.

Lemma 4.9. *1. e is a loop of $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $X(e) = 0$ for every $X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$.*
2. e is a coloop of $\mathcal{M}$ iff $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \{Xe^\alpha : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash e), \alpha \in F\}$.

Proof. 1. e is a loop of $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $\{e\}$ is a circuit of the underlying matroid, hence if and only if there is a $Y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ with $\underline{Y} = \{e\}$. But then, for every $X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$, $X \perp Y$ implies that $X(e) = 0$.

2. Recall $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}\backslash e) = \{Y\backslash e : Y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})\}$. Also, e is a coloop of $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if e is not in any circuit of the underlying matroid. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}e \text{ is a coloop of } \mathcal{M} &\Leftrightarrow Y(e) = 0\ \forall Y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})\\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp = \{Xe^\alpha : X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}\backslash e)^\perp, \alpha \in F\}\\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \{Xe^\alpha : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash e), \alpha \in F\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

5. Examples

5.1. **Rank 1 F-matroids.**

Proposition 5.1. *Let F be a hyperfield and E a finite set.*

1. *Every nonzero $\varphi \in F^E$ is a Grassmann-Plücker function for a rank 1 F-matroid.*
2. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is a rank 1 F-matroid with Grassmann-Plücker function φ then*
   (a) $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) - \{\mathbf{0}\} = F^\times\varphi$.
   (b) $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) = \{\alpha X_{e,f} : \varphi(e)\varphi(f) \neq 0, \alpha \in F^\times\} \cup \{\alpha Y_e : \varphi(e) = 0, \alpha \in F^\times\}$, *where*

$$\begin{aligned}X_{e,f}(e) &= \varphi(f)^{-1}\\ X_{e,f}(f) &= -\varphi(e)^{-1}\\ X(g) &= 0 \qquad \text{if } g \notin \{e, f\},\end{aligned}$$

   and

$$\begin{aligned}Y_e(e) &= 1\\ Y_e(g) &= 0 \qquad \text{for all } g \neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

   (c) *If e is a nonloop of $\mathcal{M}$, then $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$ consists of all $X \in F^E$ such that $X(e) \in \boxplus_{f\neq e} -X(f)\varphi(e)\varphi(f)^{-1}$.*

This follows immediately from the definitions of the various objects and the crytomorphisms in Baker ([Bak16]).

5.2. **Matroids.**

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-matroid. Then*

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \{X \in \mathbb{K}^E : \underline{X} \text{ is a union of cocircuits of } \mathcal{M}\}.$$

Proof. If $\underline{X} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k X_j$ with each $X_j \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$, then consider $Y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. Note that two elements A, B of $\mathbb{K}^E$ are orthogonal if and only if $|\underline{A} \cap \underline{B}| \neq 1$. Since $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k (\underline{X_j} \cap \underline{Y})$ and $|\underline{X_j} \cap \underline{Y}| \neq 1$ for every j, we have that $X \perp Y$. Hence $X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp = \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$.

To see the converse, we induct on the number of nonloops in X^0 for $X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. If X^0 comprises only loops, then $\underline{X}$ is the union of all cocircuits of $\mathcal{M}$. Otherwise, let $e \in X^0$ be a nonloop. Then $X\backslash e \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}/e)$ by Proposition 4.2, and by our induction hypothesis $\underline{X\backslash e} = \underline{X_1} \cap \cdots \cap \underline{X_k}$ for some $\mathbb{K}$-cocircuits $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ of $\mathcal{M}\backslash e$. But then $X_1 e^0, \ldots, X_k e^0 \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ by Theorem 3.18 of [Bak16], and $\underline{X}$ is the union of the supports of these. □

Another explanation for this equality can be given by the Inflation Property (Section 6.3).

5.3. **Oriented matroids.**

Corollary 5.3. *$\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^E$ is the set of $\mathbb{S}$-vectors of an $\mathbb{S}$-matroid with $\mathbb{S}$-circuit set $\mathcal{C}$ if and only $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of signed vectors of an oriented matroid with signed circuit set $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. For $F = \mathbb{S}$ the F-circuit axioms coincide with the usual signed circuit axioms (Corollary 1 in[Del11] and Theorem 3.6.1 in [BLVS$^+$99]). Further, $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of signed vectors of an oriented matroid if and only if $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{C}^*)^\perp$ for some signed circuit set $\mathcal{C}^*$ (Proposition 3.7.12 in [BLVS$^+$99]). In either setting, the set of signed circuits/$\mathbb{S}$-circuits corresponding to $\mathcal{W}$ is $\mathrm{Minsupp}(\mathcal{W} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$. □

5.4. **Phased matroids.** Phased matroids (i.e., Φ-matroids) seem to be where conjectures on this subject go to die. This section will give examples to show that various properties satisfied by F-covector sets when F is a field or $F = \mathbb{S}$ fail to hold when $F = \Phi$.

5.4.1. *Topological closure.* Each of the hyperfields of Example 1.6 has a topology as subspaces of $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, and hence the F-covector sets of matroids over each of these F have topologies as subspaces of F^E. In contrast to the situation in topological vector spaces, $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$ does *not* imply that $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ is topologically closed. For instance, consider Φ with topology as a subspace of $\mathbb{C}$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is the $\mathbb{C}$-matroid with

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{Row} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & i \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\mathcal{M}' = \mathrm{ph}_*(\mathcal{M})$ then it is a straightforward exercise to check that $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}') = \{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \Phi^3 : \gamma \in (i \odot \alpha) \boxplus \beta\}$. Note that $i \boxplus 1 = \{\exp(i\theta) : 0 < \theta < \pi/2\}$. Thus $(1, 1, i)$ is in the topological closure of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}')$ but is not in $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}')$.

5.4.2. *Linear independence counterexample.* Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ be as in Example 4.7, and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{ph}_*(\mathcal{M}_1) = \mathrm{ph}_*(\mathcal{M}_2)$. This $\mathcal{M}$ will shoot down the hope for a simpler characterization of F-vector sets expressed in Remark 2.20.

Definition 5.4 (cf. [Bak16])**.** $\{X_1, \ldots, X_k\} \subseteq F^E$ is **linearly dependent** if there exist elements $c_1, \ldots, c_k$ of F, not all 0, such that $\mathbf{0} \in \coprod_{j=1}^{k} c_j X_j$.

A subset of F^E is **linearly independent** if it is not linearly dependent.

Linear independence behaves badly. Not all maximal linearly independent subsets of a Φ-vector set need have the same size. In our example, $(2+i, 1+4i, 1, 1) \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_1)$ and $(2+i, 1+5i, 1, 1) \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_2)$, and so $X_1 := \mathrm{ph}(2+i, 1+4i, 1, 1)$ and $X_2 := \mathrm{ph}(2+i, 1+5i, 1, 1)$ are elements of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. Each reduced row-echelon form for $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ is a maximal linearly independent set of size 2, but also $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ contains $S := \{X_1, X_2, \mathrm{ph}(1, 1+i, 1, 0)\}$, which is easily seen to be linearly independent.

Further, the element $\mathrm{ph}(1+i, 3i, 0, 1)$ of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ can be expressed as a linear combination of S both as

$$\mathrm{ph}(1+i, 3i, 0, 1) \in (-1)X_1 \boxplus 0X_2 \boxplus \mathrm{ph}(1, 1+i, 1, 0)$$

and as

$$\mathrm{ph}(1+i, 3i, 0, 1) \in 0X_1 \boxplus (-1)X_2 \boxplus \mathrm{ph}(1, 1+i, 1, 0)$$

thus killing the simpler characterization of F-vector sets hoped for in Remark 2.20.

5.4.3. *Phase diagrams.* This section introduces a visualization tool that will be helpful in later counterexamples.

We will depict $X \in (S^1 \cup \{0\})^n$ by labelled points on a picture of S^1. (If $X(f) = 0$ then the label f is not used.) We call this the **phase diagram** for X. Thus, for instance, the leftmost circle in Figure 1 depicts $(1, 0, \exp(i\pi/2), \exp(-i\pi/2))$. It is easy to see from the phase diagram, for instance, whether $X \in \Phi^n$ or $X \in \mathbb{T}\Phi^n$ is orthogonal to $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$:

(1) In Φ^n, $X \neq \mathbf{0}$ is orthogonal to $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ if and only either the phase diagram has only two points (possibly with multiple labels), which are antipodal to each other, or the points in the phase diagram for X do not all lie in a common closed half-circle.
(2) In $\mathbb{T}\Phi^n$, $X \neq \mathbf{0}$ is orthogonal to $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ if and only if the points in the phase diagram for X do not all lie in a common open half-circle.

5.4.4. *Duality counterexample.* Now we give the example promised in Section 4.1, showing that for some Φ-matroids $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) \neq \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$.

Let

$$V = \mathrm{Row}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1+i & 1-i \\ 0 & 1 & 1-i & 1+i \end{pmatrix} = \mathrm{Row}\begin{pmatrix} 1-i & 1+i & 1 & 0 \\ 1+i & 1-i & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}_V$ denote the $\mathbb{C}$-matroid with $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_V) = V$, and let $\mathcal{M} := \mathrm{ph}_*(\mathcal{M}_V)$.

We can read off our four S^1-orbits of Φ-cocircuits of $\mathcal{M}$ from these four row vectors: one representative from each orbit is shown in Figure 1.

From the figure it's clear that any element of $(S^1)^4$ sufficiently close to $(1, 1, -1, -1)$ will be orthogonal to each of these Φ-cocircuits, hence will be in $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$. For a concrete example, $X := (1, 1, \exp(i(\pi + .01)), \exp(i(\pi + .01))) \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$. But also $(1, 1, 2, 2) \in V = \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_V)$, and so by Proposition 4.6 $\mathrm{ph}(1, 1, 2, 2) = (1, 1, 1, 1) \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. But $X \not\perp (1, 1, 1, 1)$.



FIGURE 1. Φ-cocircuits of $\mathcal{M}$ for Section 5.4.4

5.4.5. *Deletion counterexample.* Here is the horrible example promised in Section 4.2, showing that $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash e)$ need not be $\{X\backslash e : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$.

Example 5.5. (A slight variation on this example arose in [AD12].) Let

$$V := \text{Row}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & i & 1-i & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -i & 3+i & 2 \\ 0 & -i & 0 & 2i & -i & -2i & -i \\ 0 & 0 & -i & i+1 & 0 & -2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and let $\mathcal{M}_V$ be the $\mathbb{C}$-matroid with $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}_V) = V$. Let $\mathcal{M} = \text{ph}_*(\mathcal{M}_V)$. We will find an element of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash 7)$ which is not in $\{X\backslash 7 : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$.

By definition, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}_V\backslash 7) = \text{Minsupp}(\{X\backslash 7 : X \in V^\perp, X(7) = 0\} - \{\mathbf{0}\})$. We list a representative from each $\mathbb{C}^\times$-orbit below.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
(& -1+i, & -i, & 1, & \frac{1}{2}-\frac{i}{2}, & 1, & 0 &) \\
(& 2-i, & 1+i, & 1, & \frac{3}{2}+\frac{i}{2}, & 0, & 1 &) \\
(& 5-5i, & 1+3i, & -2-2i, & 0, & -3-i, & 1-i &) \\
(& 3-2i, & 1+2i, & 0, & 1+i, & -1, & 1 &) \\
(& \frac{3}{5}+\frac{4i}{5}, & 0, & 1, & \frac{7}{10}+\frac{i}{10}, & \frac{3}{5}-\frac{i}{5}, & \frac{2}{5}+\frac{i}{5} &) \\
(& 0, & \frac{7}{13}-\frac{4i}{13}, & 1, & \frac{25}{26}-\frac{5i}{26}, & \frac{8}{13}+\frac{i}{13}, & \frac{5}{13}-\frac{i}{13} &)
\end{array}$$

Let $Z_0 = (1, 1, -1, 1, 1, -1) \in \Phi^6$. It is easy to check, e.g. by drawing phase diagrams, that any element of $(S^1)^6$ sufficiently close to Z_0 is orthogonal to $\text{ph}(X)$ for each representative X above, hence is in $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash 7)$. In particular, if we let $\alpha = \exp(i\epsilon)$ with $\epsilon > 0$ small, then the function $Z_1 = (\alpha, 1, -1, 1, \alpha, -1)$ is in $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash 7)$.

On the other hand, notice that $Y_1 := (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$ and $Y_2 := (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1)$ are both in $\text{Minsupp}(V^\perp - \{\mathbf{0}\})) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}_V)$. Since $Y_1 = \text{ph}(Y_1)$ and $Y_2 = \text{ph}(Y_2)$, we have $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. Consider a $Z \in \Phi^7$ such that $Z\backslash 7 = Z_1$. Then

$$Z \odot Y_1 = \alpha \boxplus 1 \boxplus -1 \boxplus Z(7)$$

and

$$Z \odot Y_2 = -1 \boxplus 1 \boxplus \alpha \boxplus -Z(7).$$

Thus Z is orthogonal to Y_1 if and only if $Z(7)$ in the lower open half-circle of S^1, while Z is orthogonal to Y_2 if and only if $Z(7)$ in the upper open half-circle of S^1. Thus $Z_1 \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}\backslash 7) - \{Z\backslash 7 : Z \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$.

6. Composition

When we think of oriented matroids as matroids with extra structure, the signed covector set of an oriented matroid can be thought of as extra structure on the lattice of flats of the underlying matroid. That every flat underlies some signed covector follows from the Composition Axiom for oriented matroids.

For general F-matroids, this falls apart: for instance, Section 6.1 will show that for an $\mathbb{F}_2$-matroid $\mathcal{M}$, one should not expect that every flat arises as the underlying flat of an element of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. Section 6.1 will sketch the relationship between flats and F-covectors, and Section 6.2 will propose a general notion of a "composition operation", defined for a particular hyperfield F, so that existence of a composition operation implies the same relationship between flats and F-covector sets as we have in the case of oriented matroids. We will then explore composition operations on some particular hyperfields.

6.1. **Flats.**

Definition 6.1. A **hyperplane** of a matroid is the complement of a cocircuit.

A **flat** of a matroid is an intersection of hyperplanes.

Since the covectors of a matroid $\mathcal{M}$ are exactly the unions of cocircuits (Proposition 5.2), the set of flats of $\mathcal{M}$ is just $\{X^0 : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$.

As always, when we refer to matroid properties of an F-matroid we mean properties of the underlying matroid.

Proposition 6.2. *Let F be a hyperfield and $\mathcal{M}$ an F-matroid.*

1. *The set of hyperplanes of $\mathcal{M}$ is $\{X^0 : X \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$.*
2. *$\{X^0 : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$ is a subset of the set of flats of $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. (1) follows from Proposition 1.17, and (2) follows from Proposition 4.6 . □

In general, $\{X^0 : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$ may be a proper subset of the set of flats of $\mathcal{M}$. Obvious examples arise when F is a finite field, and hence $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ is the set of elements of some linear subspace of F^E. For instance, let $F = \mathbb{F}_2$, the field with two elements, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be the $\mathbb{F}_2$-matroid with $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}) = \{(0,0,0),(1,1,0),(0,1,1),(1,0,1)\}$. Then $\{1\}$, $\{2\}$, and $\{3\}$ are all hyperplanes, but their intersection $\emptyset$ is not the zero set of any F-covector of $\mathcal{M}$.

However:

Proposition 6.3. *If F is an infinite field then $\{X^0 : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$ is exactly the set of flats of $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. If X and Y are elements of a subspace of F^E then there are only finitely many $\alpha \in F$ such that $\underline{X + \alpha Y} \neq \underline{X} \cup \underline{Y}$. Thus if $X_1, \ldots, X_k \in \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})$ then we can find $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \in F$ so that

$$\underline{\sum_j \alpha_j X_j} = \bigcup_j \underline{X_j}$$

and thus

$$(\sum_j \alpha_j X_j)^0 = \bigcap_j X_j^0$$

□

This proposition inspires the following conjecture.

Conjecture 6.4. *If F is an infinite hyperfield then $\{X^0 : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$ is exactly the set of flats of $\mathcal{M}$.*

This conjecture is one motivation for looking at *composition operations*, the subject of the remainder of Section 6.2. Proposition 6.10 will prove the conjecture for any hyperfield admitting a composition operation. We'll then find composition operations for all of the hyperfields introduced in Example 1.6 except Φ.

We do not know a composition operation for Φ, and we do not know if Conjecture 6.4 holds for Φ.

6.2. **Composition operations.** The usual axioms for signed vectors of oriented matroids includes a *Composition Property*, which says that if $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$ then $X \circ Y \in \mathbb{S}^E$ defined by

$$X \circ Y(e) = \begin{cases} X(e) & \text{if } X(e) \neq 0 \\ Y(e) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is also in $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$.

Definition 6.5. A **composition operation** on a hyperfield F is a hyperoperation $\circ_F$ defined on F^E for all finite E such that

(1) For every X_1 and X_2 and every $Y \in X_1 \circ_F X_2$, $\underline{Y} = \underline{X_1} \cup \underline{X_2}$, and
(2) If $X_1 \in Z^\perp$ and $X_2 \in Z^\perp$ then $X_1 \circ_F X_2 \subseteq Z^\perp$.

When $|X_1 \circ_F X_2| = 1$ for all X_1 and X_2, we will often treat $\circ_F$ as a binary operation – as we already do for the usual composition for oriented matroids.

Remark 6.6. This definition is chosen to give us the hypotheses needed to prove the results of this section. All of the examples we will consider, including ordinary composition of oriented matroids, are, in addition, associative. Further, all of them except ϵ-composition and its inspiration, Example 6.8, satisfy the condition that $X \circ_F Y \subseteq X \boxplus Y$ for all X and Y. Both of these additional properties align with the geometric motivation for composition from oriented matroids, and both come up frequently in oriented matroid proofs. Thus Definition 6.5 should not necessarily be taken as, well, definitive.

Remark 6.7. If F admits any composition operation $\circ_F$ then the operation $\circ_0$ defined by

$$X \circ_0 Y = (X^\perp \cap Y^\perp) \cap \{Z : \underline{Z} = \underline{X} \cup \underline{Y}\}$$

is a composition operation, and $X \circ_F Y \subseteq X \circ_0 Y$ for all X and Y.

Example 6.8. The geometric motivation behind the definition of composition for oriented matroids is the observation that, if $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^E$, then for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $\text{sign}(X + \epsilon Y) = \text{sign}(X) \circ \text{sign}(Y)$, where the composition on the right-hand side is the usual oriented matroid composition.

Specifically, given $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^E$, let

$$\epsilon_0 = \min\left(\left|\frac{X(e)}{Y(e)}\right| : X(e)Y(e) < 0\right).$$

(If there is no e such that $X(e)Y(e) < 0$ then let $\epsilon_0 = \infty$.) Then $X \circ_{\mathbb{R}} Y := \{X + \epsilon Y : \epsilon < \epsilon_0\}$ is a composition operation, with the additional property that, for every $Z \in X \circ_{\mathbb{R}} Y$, $\text{sign}(Z) = \text{sign}(X) \circ \text{sign}(Y)$.

Definition 6.9. 1. For $X_1, \dots, X_k \in F^E$, define $X_1 \circ_F \cdots \circ_F X_k$ recursively:

$$X_1 \circ_F \cdots \circ_F X_k = \bigcup_{Y \in X_1 \circ_F \cdots \circ_F X_{k-1}} Y \circ_F X_k.$$

2. For $\mathcal{S} \subseteq F^E$, let $\mathcal{S}_\circ$ denote the union of all compositions $X_1 \circ_F \cdots \circ_F X_k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X_1, \dots X_k \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proposition 6.10. *Let F be a hyperfield admitting a composition operation $\circ_F$, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid.*

(1) *If $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$ then $X \circ_F Y \subseteq \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$.*
(2) *$(\mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})_\circ)^\perp = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})$.*
(3) *$\{X^0 : X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})\}$ is exactly the set of flats of the underlying matriod of $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. The first two statements follow immediately from $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}^*(\mathcal{M})^\perp$.

By Proposition 5.2 $A \subseteq E$ is a flat if and only if $E - A$ is a union of cocircuits of the underlying matroid. For any set of cocircuits, Corollary 1.19 promises the existence of F-cocircuits of $\mathcal{M}$ with these supports. The composition of these cocircuits is a subset of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ consisting of elements with support $E - A$. Thus every flat of $\mathcal{M}$ is X^0 for some $X \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. The converse is given by Proposition 6.2.

□

Example 6.11. Every signed vector of an oriented matroid is a composition of signed circuits (cf. 3.7.2 in [BLVS$^+$99]). Thus if $F = \mathbb{S}$ then $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})_\circ$, and so $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})^\perp = \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. (Compare to Section 4.1.)

Problem 6.12. Characterize the hyperfields F with some notion of composition (possibly with the additional constraints of Remark 6.6) such that every F-vector of an F-matroid $\mathcal{M}$ is contained in a composition of F-circuits of $\mathcal{M}$.

A solution to this problem would be at least a partial solution to the following.

Problem 6.13. Characterize the hyperfields F such that, for all F-matroids $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$.

6.3. **The Inflation Property.**

Proposition 6.14. *For any hyperfield F, the following are equivalent.*

(1) *For every $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in F$, if $0 \in a_1 \boxplus a_2 \neq \{0\}$ then $0 \in a_1 \boxplus a_2 \boxplus a_3$.*
(2) *If $a \in F^\times$ then $a \boxplus -a = F$.*
(3) *$1 \boxplus -1 = F$.*
(4) *For every $a \in F^\times$ and $b \in F$, $a \in a \boxplus b$.*

Proof. By Definition 1.3, for every $a, b \in F$, $0 \in a \boxplus b$ if and only if $b = -a$. Thus the hypothesis of (1) is that $a_2 = -a_1 \neq 0$ and the conclusion is that $-a_3 \in a_1 \boxplus -a_1$. Thus (1) is equivalent to (2). But also (2) is equivalent to (3) by the Distributive Property.

By Definition 1.3, for every $a, b \in F$, $b \in a \boxplus -a$ if and only if $a \in a \boxplus b$. Thus (2) is equivalent to (4). □

Definition 6.15. A hyperfield satisfying the conditions of Proposition 6.14 is said to have the **Inflation Property**.

Example 6.16. $\mathbb{K}$, $\mathbb{S}$, and $\mathbb{T}\Phi$ all satisfy the Inflation Property. .

Proposition 6.17. *If F satisfies the Inflation Property then the composition $\circ$ defined by*

$$X \circ Y(e) = \begin{cases} X(e) & \text{if } X(e) \neq 0 \\ Y(e) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is a composition operation.

Proof. Let $X, Y, Z \in F^E$ such that $X \perp Z$ and $Y \perp Z$.

If $X \odot Z = \{0\}$, then $(X \circ Y) \odot Z = Y \odot Z$, thus $X \circ Y \perp Z$.

Otherwise,

$$(X \circ Y) \odot Z = \bigboxplus_{j \in \underline{X}} X(j)Z(j)^c \boxplus \bigboxplus_{j \in X^0} Y(j)Z(j)^c$$

and since $0 \in \bigboxplus_{j \in \underline{X}} X(j)Z(j)^c$ we have $0 \in (X \circ Y) \odot Z$. □

6.4. **$\mathbb{T}$-composition.**

Lemma 6.18. *Let $\{s_1, \ldots, s_k\}$ be a finite subset of $\triangle$ with $s_1 \leq \cdots \leq s_k$. Then $0 \in \bigboxplus_{j=1}^{k} s_j$ if and only if $s_k \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j$.*

Here $\sum$ denotes usual addition in $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. $0 \in (\bigboxplus_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j) \boxplus s_k$ if and only if $s_k \in \bigboxplus_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j$. Induction on k shows that the smallest element of $\bigboxplus_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j$ is $\max(0, s_{k-1} - s_{k-1} - \cdots - s_1)$, while the largest element of $\bigboxplus_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j$ is $\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j$. Thus

$$s_k \in \bigboxplus_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j \Leftrightarrow \max(0, s_{k-1} - s_{k-1} - \cdots - s_1) \leq s_k \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} s_j$$

But the first inequality above is vacuous: for any $s_k \in \triangle$ we have $0 \leq s_k$, and by hypothesis $s_k \geq s_{k-1} \geq s_{k-1} - s_{k-1} - \cdots - s_1$.

□

Lemma 6.19. *Let $F \in \{\mathbb{T}\Phi, \mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$, and let $(s_j : j \in J)$ be a sequence in F. Then $0 \in \bigboxplus_{j \in J} s_j$ if and only if there is a $J' \subseteq J$ so that $|s_j| \leq |s_{j'}|$ for all $j \in J$ and $j' \in J'$ and $0 \in \bigboxplus_{j \in J'} s_j$.*

Also,

1. *if $F = \mathbb{T}\Phi$ or $F = \mathbb{TC}$ then $0 \in \bigboxplus_{j \in J'} s_j$ if and only if $\{s_j : j \in J'\}$ is not contained in an open half circle,*
2. *if $F = \mathbb{TR}$ then $0 \in \bigboxplus_{j \in J'} s_j$ if and only if there exists $j_1, j_2 \in J'$ such that $s_{j_1} = -s_{j_2}$, and*
3. *if $F = \mathbb{T}\triangle$ then $0 \in \bigboxplus_{j \in J'} s_j$ if and only if either $s_j = 0$ for all j or there exists $j_1 \neq j_2 \in J'$ such that $s_{j_1} = s_{j_2}$.*

The proof is easy.

Proposition 6.20. *Let $F \in \{\triangle, \mathbb{T}\Phi, \mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid. Then the operation*

$$X \circ_{\max} Y(e) = \begin{cases} X(e) & \text{if } |X(e)| \geq |Y(e)| \\ Y(e) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

is a composition operation on F.

Proof. We first give the argument for $F = \triangle$. Let $X, Y, Z \in \triangle^E$ such that $X \perp Z$ and $Y \perp Z$. Consider an f with $|(X \circ_{\max} Y)(f)Z(f)^c|$ as large as possible. Then

$$\sum_{e \neq f} (X \circ_{\max} Y)(e)Z(e)^c \geq \sum_{e \neq f} X(e)Z(e)^c$$

$$\geq X(f)Z(f)^c \qquad \text{since } 0 \in X \odot Z, \text{ by Lemma 6.18}$$

and similarly $\sum_{e \neq f}(X \circ_{\max} Y)(e)Z(e)^c \geq Y(f)Z(f)^c$. Since $(X \circ_{\max} Y)(f) \in \{X(f), Y(f)\}$, the result follows.

For $F \in \{\mathbb{T}\Phi, \mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$, let $X, Y, Z \in F^E$ such that $X \perp Z$ and $Y \perp Z$. Consider an f with $|(X \circ_{\max} Y)(f)Z(f)^c|$ as large as possible. Thus for every e

$$\begin{aligned} |(X \circ_{\max} Y)(f)Z(f)^c| &\geq |(X \circ_{\max} Y)(e)Z(e)^c| \\ &= |(X \circ_{\max} Y)(e)||Z(e)^c| \\ &\geq |X(e)Z(e)^c|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly $|(X \circ_{\max} Y)(f)Z(f)^c| \geq |Y(e)Z(e)^c|$.

If $(X \circ Y)(f) = X(f)$, then orthogonality of X and Z implies the existence of $E_0 \subseteq E$ with $|X(e)Z(e)^c| = |X(f)Z(f)^c|$ for all $e \in E_0$, and $0 \in \coprod_{e \in E_0} X(e)Z(e)^c$. Since for $e \in E_0$

$$\begin{aligned} |X(e)Z(e)^c| &= |(X \circ_T Y)(f)Z(f)^c| \\ &\geq |Y(e)Z(e)^c| \end{aligned}$$

we have $|X(e)| \geq |Y(e)|$, and so $(X \circ_T Y)(e) = X(e)$. Thus for all $e' \in E$ and $e \in E_0$,

$$|(X \circ_T Y)(e')Z(e')^c| \leq |(X \circ_T Y)(e)Z(e)^c|$$

and

$$0 \in \coprod_{e \in E_0} (X \circ_T Y)(e)Z(e)^c$$

so $0 \in (X \circ_T Y) \odot Z$.

A similar argument covers the case when $(X \circ Y)(f) = Y(f)$. □

6.5. **ϵ-composition.** This section gives a $\mathbb{T}$-analog to the operation of Example 6.8.

Definition 6.21. Let $F \in \{\triangle, \mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$, and let $X, Y \in F^E$. For each real number $\epsilon > 0$, define $X \circ_\epsilon Y \in F^E$ to be the set of Z such that, for some η with $0 < \eta < \epsilon$:

$$Z(e) = \begin{cases} X(e) & \text{if } X(e) \neq 0 \\ \eta Y(e) & \text{if } X(e) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 6.22. *Let $F \in \{\triangle, \mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$, let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid, and let $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. Then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $X \circ_\epsilon Y \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. Let $\{Z_1, \ldots, Z_k\}$ be a choice of one F-circuit from each $F^\times$-orbit of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. For each j such that $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Z_j} \neq \emptyset$, let $d_j = \max(|X(e)||Z_j(e)| : e \in E)$, and let $\epsilon_j = \min(|\frac{d_j}{Z_j(f)}| : f \in \underline{Z} - \underline{X})$. Then let ϵ be the minimum over all ϵ_j.

For all j such that $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Z_j} = \emptyset$ and for all $X' \in X \circ_\epsilon Y$ we have $X' \odot Z_j = \eta Y \odot Z_j$, for some η, and so $X' \perp \underline{Z_j}$.

If $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Z_j} \neq \emptyset$, we have slightly different arguments for $F = \triangle$ and for $F \in \{\mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$.

If $F = \triangle$ and $X' \in X \circ_\epsilon Y$, consider an f with $|X'(f)Z_j(f)^c|$ as large as possible. Then

$$\sum_{e \neq f} X'(e)Z_j(e)^c \geq \sum_{e \neq f} X(e)Z_j(e)^c$$

$$\geq X(f)Z_j(f)^c \qquad \text{since } 0 \in X \odot Z_j, \text{ by Lemma 6.18}$$

Also

$$\sum_{e \neq f} X'(e)Z_j(e)^c \geq \sum_{e \neq f} \eta Y(e)Z_j(e)^c$$

$$\geq \eta Y(f)Z_j(f)^c \qquad \text{since } 0 \in Y \odot Z_j.$$

Since $X'(f) \in \{X(f), \eta Y(f)\}$, the result follows.

If $F \in \{\mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$, then $X \odot Z_j = \coprod_{e \in \underline{X}} X(e)Z(e)^c = \{\alpha \in F : |\alpha| \leq d_j\}$. Denote this set I_{d_j}. Thus for every $X' \in X \circ_\eta Y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} X' \odot Z_j &= \coprod_{e \in \underline{X}} X(e)Z_j(e)^c \boxplus \coprod_{f \in \underline{Z_j} - \underline{X}} \eta Y(f)Z_j(f)^c \\ &= I_{d_j} \boxplus \coprod_{f \in \underline{Z_j} - \underline{X}} \eta Y(f)Z_j(f)^c \\ &= I_{d_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $X' \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})^\perp$. □

7. Sum conjectures

When K is a field and $\mathcal{M}$ is a K-matroid, obviously $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ is closed under (hyper)addition. In contrast, even for an $\mathbb{S}$-matroid $\mathcal{M}$, if $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ then $X \boxplus Y$ is typically not a subset of $\mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. However, each of the following conjectures is well-known to be true for matroids over fields, $\mathbb{K}$, and $\mathbb{S}$.

Conjecture 7.1. *(Closure) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ then $(X \boxplus Y) \cap \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) \neq \emptyset$.*

Conjecture 7.2. *(Elimination) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ and $X(e) = -Y(e)$ then there is a $Z \in (X \boxplus Y) \cap \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) \neq \emptyset$ such that $Z(e) = 0$.*

In fact, the preceding conjecture is the hyperfield version of a standard axiom for oriented matroids. The following stronger conjecture is equivalent to Elimination in the case of oriented matroids.

Conjecture 7.3. *(Hyperelimination) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$ and $\alpha \in X(e) \boxplus Y(e)$ then there is a $Z \in (X \boxplus Y) \cap \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M}) \neq \emptyset$ such that $Z(e) = \alpha$.*

As a small contribution to the study of $X \boxplus Y$, we have the following.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $F \in \{\mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an F-matroid and $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$. Assume there is at most one value e such that $|X_1(e)| = |X_2(e)| \neq 0$ and $X_1(e) \neq X_2(e)$. Then $X_1 \boxplus X_2 \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. Let $Z \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. If $\underline{Z} \cap \underline{X_1} = \emptyset$ then for every $X' \in X_1 \boxplus X_2$ we have $X' \odot Z = X_2 \odot Z$, and so $X' \perp Z$. Similarly if $\underline{Z} \cap \underline{X_2} = \emptyset$ then every $X' \in X_1 \boxplus X_2$ is in $Z^\perp$.

Now assume $\underline{Z} \cap \underline{X_1} \neq \emptyset$ and $\underline{Z} \cap \underline{X_2} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, by Lemma 6.19 there are constants c_1, c_2 and nonempty subsets S_1, S_2 of E such that for $j \in \{1, 2\}$,

(1) for all $e \in E$, $|X_j(e)Z(e)^c| \leq c_j$, with equality if and only if $e \in S_j$, and
(2) $\mathbf{0} \in \boxplus_{e \in S_j} X_j(e)Z(e)^c$.

If $c_1 \neq c_2$, without loss of generality assume $c_2 > c_1$. Then for each $f_1 \in S_2$ and each $X' \in X_1 \boxplus X_2$ we have $X'(f_1) = X_2(f_1)$. Also, for every $f_2 \in E - S_2$ we have $|X'(f_2)Z(f_2)^c| < c_2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} X' \odot Z &= \boxplus_{e \in E} X'(e)Z(e)^c \\ &= \boxplus_{e \in S_2} X'(e)Z(e)^c \\ &= \boxplus_{e \in S_2} X_2(e)Z(e)^c \end{aligned}$$

and this final hypersum contains 0.

If $c_1 = c_2$, then for each $X' \in X_1 \boxplus X_2$, $|X'(e)Z(e)^c|$ is maximized at each $e \in S_1 \cup S_2$, and further, by our hypothesis, $X'(e) = X_1(e) = X_2(e)$ for all but at most one element e_0 of $S_1 \cap S_2$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} X' \odot Z &= \boxplus_{e \in E} X'(e)Z(e)^c \\ &= \boxplus_{e \in S_1 \cup S_2} X'(e)Z(e)^c \end{aligned}$$

and for $j \in \{1, 2\}$

$$0 \in X_j(e_0)Z(e_0)^c \boxplus \boxplus_{e \in S_1 \cup S_2 - \{e_0\}} X_j(e)Z(e)^c$$

$$\begin{aligned} -X_j(e_0)Z(e_0)^c &\in \boxplus_{e \in S_1 \cup S_2 - \{e_0\}} X_j(e)Z(e)^c \qquad \text{by Lemma 1.4} \\ &= \boxplus_{e \in E - \{e_0\}} X'(e)Z(e)^c \end{aligned}$$

and so by Lemma 7.5

$$\begin{aligned} -X'(e_0)Z(e_0)^c &\in \boxplus_{e \in E - \{e_0\}} X'(e)Z(e)^c \\ 0 &\in \boxplus_{e \in E} X'(e)Z(e)^c \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.5. *$F \in \{\mathbb{TR}, \mathbb{TC}, \mathbb{T}\triangle\}$. Let S be a subset of F and $a, b \in F$. If $\{a, b\} \subseteq \boxplus_{s \in S} s$ then $a \boxplus b \subseteq \boxplus_{s \in S} s$.*

This follows immediately from Lemma 6.19.

References

[AD12] Laura Anderson and Emanuele Delucchi, *Foundations for a theory of complex matroids*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **48** (2012), no. 4, 807–846. MR 3000567

[Bak16] Matthew Baker, *Matroids over hyperfields*, 2016, arXiv:1601.01204.

[BLVS+99] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Günter M. Ziegler, *Oriented matroids*, second ed., Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 46, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. MR MR1744046 (2000j:52016)

[Del11] Emanuele Delucchi, *Modular elimination in matroids and oriented matroids*, European J. Combin. **32** (2011), no. 3, 339–343. MR 2764796

[DW92] Andreas W. M. Dress and Walter Wenzel, *Valuated matroids*, Adv. Math. **93** (1992), no. 2, 214–250. MR 1164708

[GG15] Jeffrey Giansiracusa and Noah Giansiracusa, *A Grassmann algebra for matroids*, 2015.

[Oxl92] James G. Oxley, *Matroid theory*, Oxford Science Publications, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1992. MR MR1207587 (94d:05033)

[Vir10] Oleg Viro, *Hyperfields for tropical geometry I. hyperfields and dequantization*, 2010, arXiv:1006.3034.

E-mail address: laura@math.binghamton.edu

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY 13902-6000, USA.